

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT

10/550085

ON PATENTABILITY

Int. File No. PCT/EP2004/001660

Supplementary Page

Re Point I

This report has been drawn up on the basis of the **following Application documents:**

In the version for the following contracting states:

AL AT BE BG CH CY CZ DE DK EE ES FI FR GB GR HU IE IT LI LT LU
LV MC MK NL PL PT RO SE SI SK TR

Specification, Pages:

1-7 original version

Patent Claims, No.:

1-12 original version

The drawings, sheets:

1/5-5/5 original version

Re Point V.

**Reasoned Statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) PCT with regard to
Novelty, Inventive Step and Industrial Applicability;
Citations and Explanations Supporting Such Statement**

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US-B1-6,369,685 (CHAPUIS ALAIN ET AL) April 9, 2002
(2002-04-09)

D2: DE 197 46 919 A (DAIMLER CHRYSLER AG) May 6, 1999
(1999-05-06), mentioned in the Application

1. Novelty Article 33(2)PCT

- 1.1 The present application does not satisfy the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of **Claims 1 and 2** is not novel within the meaning of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document **D1** discloses (the references in parentheses relate to this document):

A transmitter head (Fig. 1, reference numeral [rn] 12) including a support (Fig. 1, rn. 10) which is connected to at least one ferrite core (Fig. 2, rn. 24), the ferrite core being constructed at least partially in an E-shape (col. 4, l. 4, Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, rn. 24) and a flat winding being disposed about one limb of the E (Fig. 2, rn. 16).

Therefore, all the features of **Claim 1** are known from **D1**. For that reason, the subject matter of Claim 1 is not novel within the meaning of Article 33(1) and (2) PCT.

- 1.2 The subject matter of **Claim 2** differs from that of Claim 1 only by a statement of objective which does not restrict the extent of protection. Therefore, the statements made under 1.1 above hold true correspondingly for the subject matter of Claim 2. Thus, the subject matter of Claim 2 is also not novel within the meaning of Article 33(1) and (2) PCT.

- 1.3 Dependent **Claims 3 and 8 through 11** do not include any features that, in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, fulfill the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty; see document **D1** and the corresponding passages indicated in the Search Report.

2. Inventive Step Article 33(3) PCT

- 2.1 The present application does not satisfy the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of **Claim 12** is not based on an inventive step within the meaning of Article 33(3) PCT.

Document **D2** is considered to be the most proximate related art with respect to the subject matter of Claim 12. It discloses an energy transmission system having a transmitter head including a support that is connected to at least one ferrite core (col. 2, l. 28 through 36, Fig. 1 and 2); two line conductors being laid in the floor with a mutual distance A; and the distance of the transmitter head from the floor being between $0.05 \cdot A$ and $0.2 \cdot A$ (col. 2, l. 37 through 53, Fig. 1 and 2; it is disclosed there that the total width of the neutral conductor is a multiple of the distance between the primary side and the secondary side).

Therefore, the subject matter of **Claim 12** differs from the disclosure of **D2** in that the ferrite core is at least partially E-shaped, and the flat winding is disposed about one limb of the E.

Thus, the objective to be achieved with the present invention can be seen in providing an energy transmission system with improved efficiency.

The solution proposed in **Claim 12** of the present Application cannot be regarded as inventive for the following reasons (Article 33(3) PCT):

From **D1**, a transmitter head is already known (see above under 1.1), whose ferrite core is at least partially E-shaped, the flat winding being disposed about one limb of the E (col. 3, l. 56 through col. 4, l. 23, Fig. 2).

The teachings of documents D1 and D2 both relate to the same special field, H01F, so that one skilled in the art would have combined the two teachings with each other.

- 2.2. Dependent **Claims 4 through 7** do not include any features that, in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, fulfill the requirements of the PCT with regard to inventive step; see documents **D1 and D2** and the corresponding passages indicated in the Search Report.